

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed January 11, 2008 has been carefully considered. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Interview Record

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the courtesy and consideration extended to Applicants' undersigned representative during the telephone interview with Examiner Reuben Brown on May 2, 2008.

During the interview, it was explained to Examiner Brown that unlike in Tanigawa or Mao, the updating in the presently claimed invention does not involve the user terminal, which is in fact distinct from the distribution system. Examiner Brown agreed that if the distinction between the user terminal and the distribution system could be clearly conveyed in the claims, then the claims would prove patentable over Tanigawa and Mao because in these patents the updating does not occur exclusively at the distribution system and not at the user terminal. The claim amendments submitted herewith are made with the intent of clarifying that the user terminal is distinct from the distribution system in which the updating takes place.

Rejection(s) Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

Claims 1-44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Tanigawa (U.S. pat. no. 7,305,698) in view of Mao (U.S. pat. no. 7,096,484).

As explained above, in accordance with the presently claimed invention, link list updating is conducted exclusively at the video distribution system, which is distinct from the video distribution system. The independent claims have been amended to reflect this distinction (user terminal can be connected to the video distribution system, implying that these two are distinct), and already recite the exclusivity feature. For this reason at least, the presently claimed invention is patentable over Tanigawa and Mao, considered singularly or in combination, the rejection of claims 1-44 based on these references should be withdrawn.

Newly-Added Claims

Claims 45 and 46 have been added to further particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention.

Conclusion

In view of the preceding discussion, Applicants respectfully urge that the claims of the present application define patentable subject matter and should be passed to allowance.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone call would help advance prosecution of the present invention, the Examiner is kindly invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number below.

Please charge any additional required fees, including those necessary to obtain extensions of time to render timely the filing of the instant Amendment and/or Reply to Office Action, or credit any overpayment not otherwise credited, to our deposit account no. 50-1698.

Respectfully submitted,
THELEN REID BROWN RAYSMAN & STEINER LLP

Dated: 06/11/2008

/Khaled Shami/
Khaled Shami
Reg. No. 38,745

THELEN REID BROWN RAYSMAN & STEINER LLP
P.O. Box 640640
San Jose, CA 95164-0640
Tel. (408) 292-5800
Fax. (408) 287-8040